

---

**CORPUS CHRISTI METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**February 19, 2026**

**1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, AND QUORUM DETERMINATION**

Mr. DeLatte called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

TAC Members Present:

Mr. Brian DeLatte, City of Portland, Chairperson

Mr. Jeff Pollack, Port of Corpus Christi, Vice Chairperson

Mr. Jason Alvarez, P.E. City of Corpus Christi

Ms. Paula Sales-Evans, P.E. Texas Department of Transportation-Corpus Christi District

Mr. Juan Pimentel, P.E. Nueces County

Ms. Liann Alfaro, Corpus Christi Regional Transportation Authority

MPO Staff Present:

Rob MacDonald, P.E., Jafet Flores, Harry Horak, Victor Mendieta, and Carissa Tamez

**2. NON-AGENDA ITEMS PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None were made or offered.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE TAC January 15, 2026 REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

Ms. Sales-Evans requested a correction to the discussion recorded under Item 6A regarding the boundary change. She requested that in the last sentence, the word “questioned” be revised to “inquired” when referring to whether port infrastructure exists outside the MPO boundary. She explained that her intent was to seek clarification rather than to render an opinion or judgment. She further suggested maintaining the reference to questioning the RTA routes outside the MPO boundary but clarifying the wording to accurately reflect her intent.

**Motion:**

Ms. Sales- Evans made a motion to approve the TAC January 15, 2026 Regular Meeting minutes subject to corrections on item 6A.

Mr. Pimentel seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

**4. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEMS**

**A. DRAFT FY 2025-2028 TIP with Amendment 3**

Mr. Flores presented this item.

The Corpus Christi MPO staff developed the DRAFT FY 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) with Amendment 3 for review by the TAC and TPC. The proposed changes to the DRAFT FY 2025-2028 TIP as part of Amendment 3 is consistent with the proposed DRAFT 2045 MTP Update with Amendment 2.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Sales-Evans stated that she understood revisions were being made in February to amend the project description for the SH 35 & SH 361 Gregory project. She inquired whether the description shown in the table in Attachment 2 should be updated to reflect the revised language, as it currently still references “direct connectors.” She further asked if, with the February exception proposed for removal, the updated language should replace the existing description.

- 
- Mr. MacDonald responded that the language in question is identical to previously approved language. He explained that prior TIP amendments were submitted under earlier STIP provisions to remove the exception. He further stated that the February STIP revision is intended to clarify this for TxDOT and TPP staff, as no new TIP amendment is being proposed to change the language. He emphasized that the language has already been amended for several months.
  - Ms. Sales-Evans clarified that her concern pertains to the project name. She noted that it continues to appear as “State Hwy 35 Interchange Direct Connectors” and stated that she had understood the project name had been changed.
  - Mr. MacDonald clarified that the project description is pulled verbatim from TxDOT Connect, which may cause the language to appear unusual at times, as it is directly cut and pasted from the system. He stated that unless TxDOT has revised the language in recent weeks, the current wording reflects what is listed in TxDOT Connect. He added that if TxDOT has updated the language, it can be incorporated accordingly and included as part of the motion.
  - Ms. Sales-Evans stated that she will look it up, as she believed the project name had previously been changed but acknowledged that may not be the case.

Mr. Alvarez inquired about the status of the Park Road 22 project. He stated that if the project is moved out of the current TIP, the city would request that it be added to the next available TIP as soon as possible. He further noted the City’s commitment to work diligently with TxDOT to advance the project and move it forward.

- Mr. MacDonald stated that the project is on track to be included in the next TIP. He noted that the upcoming TIP covers FY 2027 through 2030 and mentioned that, he informed City Council recently. He confirmed that the Park Road 22 project will be slotted into one of the four years within that TIP.

**Motion:**

Ms. Sales-Evans made a motion to recommend the TPC to approve the DRAFT FY 2025-2028 TIP with Amendment 3, through Resolution 26-02 subject to reviewing the project names for the SH 35 & SH 361 projects.

Ms. Alfaro seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

**B. DRAFT 2045 MTP Update with Amendment 2**

Mr. Flores presented this item.

The Corpus Christi MPO staff developed the DRAFT 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update (2045 MTP Update) with Amendment 2 for review by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), TPC, and the public. The proposed changes to the 2045 MTP Update as part of Amendment 2 is consistent with the proposed DRAFT FY 2025-2028 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) with Amendment 3.

**Discussion:**

Mr. MacDonald clarified that the Park Road 22 project is included in the 20-year plan, which has a 10-year component. He explained that the project has slipped from the first four years into the second four years within that 10-year period. He emphasized that the project should not be removed but shown further out in time, aligning with the City’s request. He noted that the MTP reflects this placement and that the timing will be refined when the new TIP is developed.

**Motion:**

Ms. Sales- Evans made a motion to recommend the TPC to approve the DRAFT 2045 MTP Update with Amendment 2, though Resolution 26-02 subject to reviewing the project names for the SH 35 & SH 361 projects.

---

Ms. Alfaro seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

**C. DRAFT 2025 Congestion Management Process (CMP)**

Mr. MacDonald presented this item.

Congestion management is the application of strategies to improve transportation system performance and reliability by reducing the adverse impacts of congestion on the movement of people and goods. A congestion management process (CMP) is a systematic and regionally accepted approach for managing recurring and nonrecurring congestion. This includes providing accurate, up-to-date information on travel times, location of construction or crashes, and strategies for congestion reduction that meet state and local needs. The CMP is intended to move these congestion management strategies into the funding and implementation stages.

**Discussion:**

None.

**Motion:**

Mr. Pollack made a motion to recommend the TPC release the DRAFT 2025 Congestion Management Process for a one-month public comment.

Ms. Sales-Evans seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

**D. DRAFT 2025 Program for Addressing Discrimination (PAD)**

Mr. MacDonald presented this item.

As discussed earlier in 2025, the Corpus Christi MPO Title VI policy document is due for an update. The updated DRAFT 2025 Program for Addressing Discrimination (PAD) was provided. The TAC received an earlier version of this document in the July 2025 Regular Meeting Agenda Packet. As reported by FHWA, and discussed in previous meetings, several executive actions have impacted environmental justice (EJ) considerations within metropolitan transportation planning regulations. The actions collectively reduce the emphasis on environmental justice and equity considerations in metropolitan transportation planning and related federal infrastructure initiatives.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Pollack asked for clarification, noting that the proposed changes in the earlier version of this year's draft appear to have been removed, and the document has reverted to the pre-existing version.

- Mr. MacDonald confirmed that this is correct.

**Motion:**

Mr. Pollack made a motion to recommend the TPC release the DRAFT 2025 PAD for a one-month public comment period.

Ms. Alfaro seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

**E. Corpus Christi MPO Boundary Change Process**

Mr. MacDonald presented this item.

The Corpus Christi MPO Planning Area Boundary Change process has been ongoing for about two years. The MPO Staff provided the TAC with the current discussion topics for the meeting on February 19, 2026. The goal was to enable TAC to make a recommendation on the various components of a proposed boundary and eventually recommend to the TPC a DRAFT MPO Planning Area Boundary Change. The MPA Boundary is one component of the future Boundary Change Package required by TxDOT.

**General Discussion:**

---

Mr. DeLatte asked for clarification regarding the triangular parcel, inquiring whether it would be included regardless of the outcome. He asked what would occur if Robstown does not pass a resolution supporting the inclusion—would the triangular piece still be incorporated, or what would happen in that scenario?

- Mr. MacDonald responded that, according to the methodology and in consultation with TxDOT, the triangular area will be included, provided a good faith effort was made to communicate with Robstown.

Mr. DeLatte acknowledged that the boundary change process has been ongoing for more than two years and expressed appreciation for the hard work and collaboration that has brought the committee to this point. He noted that the group is close to finalizing decisions and hopes that today's meeting will produce recommendations from TAC. He highlighted that there are five distinct areas requiring discussion and recommendation. Rather than addressing all five in a single motion, he suggested breaking them into separate decision points. He also noted that the discussion order might be slightly different from how the items were initially presented, starting with the first two items that address the overall boundary.

#### **Discussion 1 (RTA Service Area):**

Ms. Sales-Evans suggested starting the discussion with the RTA service area. She explained that the outcome of that discussion could influence several of the other areas under consideration. She recommended addressing the RTA service area first before moving on to the remaining items.

Ms. Alfaro noted during the last TAC meeting that the CCRTA will not be providing a full recommendation regarding the proposed boundary changes. She clarified that any boundary decisions would not impact existing transit services in those areas. The TAC agenda packet provided includes communication from the FTA indicating that as long as the MPO has coordinated with the RTA and engaged in discussions with the FTA, the ultimate decision on boundaries rests with the MPO and the governor. Based on current information and coordination efforts, Ms. Alfaro concluded that inclusion of these areas is not required solely because transit services operate there.

Ms. Sales-Evans commented that recommending the addition of certain areas could limit the decision-making authority of the City of Robstown and the City of Port Aransas. She noted uncertainty regarding how coordination with these cities would proceed if such a recommendation were made. Her recommendation is to not add additional areas, as long as the RTA can continue providing its current services regardless of whether these areas are included.

Mr. DeLatte responded that the discussion would group the RTA service area with minor boundary adjustments along roadways, treating them as a single discussion topic. He also added that the discussion will include the RTA boundary. He noted that the current map shows the existing MPO boundary, which does not include the RTA service areas in Robstown and Port Aransas. He explained that the process was paused to allow for ongoing discussions with the FTA.

#### **Motion 1 (RTA Service Area):**

Ms. Sales-Evans made a motion to recommend that the RTA service areas that are outside of the current proposed boundary not be incorporated.

Ms. Alfaro seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

---

## Discussion 2 (Micro Changes and Ship Channel):

Mr. DeLatte noted that there are several micro-level boundary adjustments remaining, including: minor modifications to roadways, rights-of-way in the Port area, adjustments along the Gulf within the Corpus Christi city limits, and proposed changes along the ship channel. He recommended that these refinements be addressed through a TEAMS meeting and brought directly to the Policy Committee for final action, rather than returning them to the TAC, as they are adjustments rather than major changes.

Mr. Pollack referred to the previous month's discussion, noting he had described his suggested changes in prose but had not sent a marked-up map, but has now prepared a markup and will submit it to the MPO. He emphasized that his suggested adjustment should not delay the current process and could be addressed as part of the micro-adjustment phase described by Mr. DeLatte. He proposed including the full extent of the ship channel out to the 54th foot contour, extending to the shoreline along Mustang and North Padre Islands. Mr. Pollack clarified that this adjustment would not materially impact land-side service areas but would help the MPO capture all potential improvements in the regional mobility system over time.

Ms. Sales-Evans requested that the Committee review the Port Aransas area to better visualize the city limits and urban boundaries.

Mr. Pollack explained that the proposal would effectively create a "donut" configuration around Port Aransas. He noted that the ship channel currently encompasses three sides of the island but stops irregularly and somewhat arbitrarily in front of it. Rather than maintaining that uneven boundary, the proposal would extend the channel, continue it around the island, follow the established ship channel alignment outward, and terminate at the effective end of the channel at the 54-foot contour. He emphasized that this approach would create a more logical and continuous boundary and added that a shapefile can be provided to clearly identify the exact endpoint of the channel in the Gulf.

Mr. DeLatte requested Mr. Pollack to pass around the mark-up map.

Ms. Sales-Evans inquired whether the proposed recommendation would attach to or include any land-side areas along the shipping channel.

- Mr. Pollack responded that the intent was simply to capture the areas operating from the toe of the channel on both sides.

Ms. Sales-Evans asked whether the proposal would exclude land-side operations, such as the Port Aransas Ferry operations, noting that although the ferry crosses the channel, it is land-based.

- Mr. Pollack responded that it potentially could include such operations. He clarified that, at a minimum, the version he is proposing would not change any existing land-side boundaries. The only possible adjustment discussed would be bringing the line in the Gulf to the shoreline and carrying it along the shoreline, though he stated he is ambivalent about that approach. He noted that if there is a reason to maintain the current alignment due to city limit boundaries, he is agnostic on that point. He acknowledged that including the entire ship channel would extend across Port Aransas city limits on the water side but indicated he is uncertain whether that would present a fundamental issue.
- Mr. MacDonald added from a staff perspective that remaining within the water boundary would be acceptable. He stated that he could not anticipate the City of Port Aransas challenging the MPO's boundary if it remains in the water.
  - Mr. Pollack responded that they could provide a shapefile of the toe of the channel if needed. He noted that providing the shapefile would help show the full picture and avoid raising additional questions.

- 
- Mr. MacDonald stated that including the shapefile would be a good addition to the minor modifications.
  - Ms. Sales-Evans stated that TxDOT would support the proposal, provided it remains off the land-side portion.

Mr. Pollack inquired why the MPO boundary on the west side, specifically in the Central area, deviates from the municipal boundary and excludes some habitat. He suggested that, as part of a micro adjustment, the boundary could simply follow the municipal boundary. While noting that the difference is nonmaterial, he highlighted potential opportunities for habitat restoration projects in the area, which would not qualify for category funding, and mentioned that some port activities could be relevant. He emphasized that this is not a critical issue but raised the point for consistency.

Ms. Sales-Evans asked if Port Aransas have a ETJ area that is not shown within the Map?

- Mr. MacDonald stated that the boundary in question is based on the existing boundary, which has been in place for decades. He noted that minor modifications could be made to match the city limits and incorporate the small islands in that area. While he could not specify exactly how the line was originally set, he emphasized that there is an opportunity to adjust the boundary at this location to align it with the city limits.

Ms. Sales-Evans sought clarification on whether the discussion involved adding anything different from the earlier motion regarding the RTA service area. She asked whether the intent was simply to maintain the previous decision of not including the area, or if a new motion was being proposed to adjust the boundary to incorporate the ship channel, noting she wanted to be clear on what was being asked.

- Mr. DeLatte stated that the boundary would be adjusted according to Mr. Pollack's markup map.
- Mr. Pollack added that the boundary on the water side could be incorporated into the previous action. He suggested that, although a separate motion had already been taken, the prior motion could be amended to include the boundary on the west side.
- Mr. MacDonald responded that MPO staff understand the situation and that the micro changes will clean up the area around Port Aransas, noting that a separate motion is not necessary.

### **Motion 2 (Micro changes and Ship Channel):**

Mr. Pollack made a motion to recommend a TEAMS meeting with MPO, TxDOT and any TAC members that wish to join to go through the entire boundary shown in the packet, to work through, minor modifications along roadways, along right of ways, or any other natural boundaries, also to include the map that Mr. Pollack passed around showing the modification of the ship channel in relation to Port Aransas, and that the result of that TEAMS meeting will be forwarded to the TPC as TAC recommendation.

Ms. Sales-Evans seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

### **Discussion 3 (Robstown):**

Mr. DeLatte moved on to the Robstown boundary, noting that the Census-designated portion, a triangular area, will be included regardless of discussions with the City of Robstown. He suggested that the remainder of Robstown be addressed only if the city formally requests inclusion.

Ms. Sales-Evans stated that, from her perspective, she would prefer to wait for Robstown to make a formal request before making any recommendation. She noted that if the city does not request inclusion, there may be no need to address it.

- Mr. MacDonald agreed with that perspective, adding they will report on how the meeting proceeds. He noted that staff's preference is to pass the resolution of support by accepting only the triangular portion of Robstown. For TAC, if there is concurrence, a motion could be

---

made to move forward with including just the triangular piece of Robstown in the MPO boundary.

Mr. DeLatte asked for a reminder on the history of potentially including all of Robstown in the boundary. He inquired whether that was initiated by the City of Robstown, suggested by the MPO, or arose in some other way, and why the matter is currently in a holding pattern.

- Mr. MacDonald clarified that once the MPO includes any portion of the City of Robstown, it opens up options for the city. He reminded members that during a joint workshop with TAC and the Policy Committee, federal partners explained that a city could join the MPO boundary either just for a small portion—like the triangular piece—or for its entire city boundary, since the boundary lies within the city limits. Following TxDOT guidance, the MPO could accept only the triangular piece. If transit needs were a factor for Robstown, the city might request inclusion of more of its boundary, but since no transit addition is recommended, the triangular piece remains the practical option. Mr. MacDonald further explained that if Robstown joined the MPO entirely, it would affect its eligibility for TxDOT rural program funding. Currently, the city receives rural program funds, but full MPO membership would shift it into competition for Metro funding, which may not provide comparable value. He noted that TxDOT had discussed this with prior city leadership, and he plans to relay the information to the current mayor, reporting back to TAC. MPO staff's recommendation, if concurred by TAC, is to support including only the triangular piece. He added that the idea of full city inclusion originated from federal partners, who have observed that cities outside MPOs may choose to join partially or fully, but he has not heard any request from Robstown in the last six months. The city council is expected to consider the matter in March.

Mr. Mendieta added that the discussion about Robstown's boundary is connected to Port Aransas. He noted that for the ship channel, even though it is in the water, crossing into a small portion of Robstown's city limits would still technically fall within the city's jurisdiction. He suggested that this scenario should be considered in the same way as the boundary considerations for Robstown.

- Mr. Pollack responded that this is an interesting question, noting a material difference compared to Robstown. He explained that the Port owns the patent land beneath the ship channel and questioned whether, as a political subdivision of the state, the Port is legally subject to municipal zoning. He recalled that several years ago, the Port reached secondary agreements with both the City of Corpus Christi and the City of Port Aransas for projects that would have fallen within city limits, adhering to development codes and paying fees but stopping short of formally recognizing municipal zoning to avoid conflicts. In other cases, the Port has complied with municipal zoning requirements, though these have not been legally challenged. He emphasized that this situation is materially different from Robstown because the Port is a state political subdivision and owns the underlying lands, suggesting that the two cases should not necessarily be treated the same.
- Mr. MacDonald suggested that the MPO consult with TxDOT, noting that TxDOT has addressed similar situations with other ports and waterways across Texas. He recommended reviewing the proposed boundary change and getting guidance from TxDOT headquarters, recalling that Robstown is treated differently because it is a census-designated area, whereas Port Aransas is not. However, as Mr. Mendieta pointed out, it remains a consideration for the MPO. Mr. MacDonald emphasized that TxDOT could provide recommendations or advice, given their experience with other ship channels and inland waterways. He suggested proceeding with this consultation while continuing to implement minor boundary tweaks.

---

### Motion 3 (Robstown):

Ms. Sales-Evans made a motion to recommend including the triangular area within Robstown that's coming in as part of the Census Designated Urban Area.

Pimentel seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. DeLatte moved the discussion to the last item regarding the boundary for the City of Gregory and their potential inclusion on the TAC and TPC.

Mr. MacDonald explained that the City of Gregory has an irregular MPO boundary, and the proposed boundary cuts through the city without including its entire area or new urban growth. He noted that Gregory has always been an MPO member and that the current adjustments are intended as a cleanup. If the city wishes to modify its boundary, it may submit a recommendation as a member. The main point for TAC discussion is that the Mayor of Gregory has expressed a desire to speak on behalf of the city at the MPO. This statement is now several months old. The original discussion focused on whether Gregory wanted to adjust its boundary to align with city limits or roadways, not on joining the MPO. The City of Gregory indicated they would like the opportunity to speak for themselves, and TAC's input is now requested to guide a recommendation to the TPC.

Ms. Sales-Evans inquired about the MPO bylaws concerning the process for consideration, asking whether the bylaws are silent on the matter or if there are additional provisions for members.

- Mr. MacDonald explained that the bylaws address changes specifically for naming seated members. While the City of Gregory has always been an MPO member, the bylaws do not explicitly list them as members of the TAC or Policy Committee. Historically, the city has been represented on both committees by San Patricio County, based on an informal understanding rather than a formal agreement. To formally recognize Gregory as a seated member, the bylaws would need to be amended, as their current representation has been more of an unwritten tradition.

Mr. DeLatte stated that, in practice, the City of Gregory has been represented by San Patricio County. He then asked TAC members if they had any discussion or input on this topic to inform potential recommendations to the Policy Committee.

Ms. Sales-Evans noted that it is challenging for the TAC to determine an appropriate recommendation, since the City of Gregory has already been within the MPO boundary and represented through San Patricio County. She added that, as mentioned earlier regarding Robstown, the level of engagement from smaller communities can vary depending on the mayor, which may affect their interest in active participation. From a political standpoint, she suggested that the matter might be more appropriate for consideration at the Policy Committee level and expressed uncertainty about what specific recommendation the TAC should provide regarding the city's request.

- Mr. DeLatte added that, practically speaking, the area is represented by the San Patricio County Commissioner. He noted that recognizing Gregory directly could result in three members of the Policy Committee and three members of the TAC representing this small area between Portland and Gregory, out of eight total members. While this arrangement may benefit Portland and San Patricio County, he expressed concern that it would not be proportionate to the entire region and said he would have a hard time justifying it.
- Mr. Pollack added that, while he understands how the current situation arose, it seems illogical when considering proportionate representation of the population across the region.
- Mr. MacDonald noted that he will reach out to the mayor of Gregory again, as there has not been a recurring update for several months. He clarified that TAC members are free to make their own recommendations to the Policy Committee, but he wants to confirm the city's

---

current intent. Unlike Robstown, Gregory's boundary does not present rural versus urban funding issues for TxDOT, and although the city lacks transit service, it does have a CCRTA park-and-ride facility. From his perspective, the TAC could remain silent on the matter and allow the Policy Committee to make its own decision, pending confirmation from Gregory.

Ms. Sales-Evans suggested that while Mr. MacDonald reaches out to the mayor of Gregory, it might be helpful for the city to attend the next Policy Board meeting and observe it to gain a better understanding of the dynamics and topics discussed.

- Mr. MacDonald responded that he would inform the mayor and the city administrator of Gregory regarding the suggestion to attend or observe the next Policy Board meeting.

Mr. DeLatte noted that the TAC will remain silent on the issue until Mr. MacDonald is able to report back and asked if there was any other discussion regarding the boundary change process.

- Mr. MacDonald reiterated his thanks to the TAC, noting that the discussion helps staff as they work to move the process forward. He emphasized the importance of avoiding delays that could create a mid-summer workload crunch, reminding members that approval from the governor's office has historically taken significant time despite TxDOT recommendations. He acknowledged potential implications for federal partners if the boundary is not changed by December but concluded by thanking the TAC again and expressing hope for a timely resolution.

#### **F. DRAFT 2050 MTP Chapters and Appendices**

Mr. Flores presented this item.

The Corpus Christi MPO staff continues development of the Chapters and Appendices of the DRAFT 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (2050 MTP).

Chapter 2: Outreach and Coordination was provided for review by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), our partner agencies, and the public. As the development of the 2050 MTP continues, there will be ongoing opportunity to update this chapter until the entire MTP is approved in April 2027.

Once the TAC recommends and the TPC approves the documents for release for use in the DRAFT 2050 MTP development and public process, MPO staff will make all the documents available on our website. The Corpus Christi MPO's Social Pinpoint public outreach website for the DRAFT 2050 MTP will be updated with draft Chapters and Appendices as they become available.

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Pollack mentioned that he appreciated the format of the chapter, particularly the inclusion of discrete policies and sub-policies. He suggested a change in wording to Policy Three. The concern is that it should be very declarative in expressing the intent to actively engage citizens, rather than simply encourage participation. Those are materially different approaches. Policy Two focuses on making information available, which is more of a one-way flow. Policy Three should emphasize active engagement as a stronger commitment than encouragement alone. Mr. Pollack provided the revision to the policy to read: "Corpus Christi MPO shall actively engage area citizens to encourage involvement in the transportation planning process."

Ms. Sales-Evans asked if that recommendation affects any of the sub-section policies.

- Mr. Pollack responded that he doesn't believe the change is necessary. He mentioned that he would need to look back at the language, but he recalls thinking that the sub-policies taken together already represent active engagement. For that reason, he felt the overarching policy was appropriately strong as written.

---

Mr. Mendieta reminded the TAC that the policies under discussion were taken directly from the Public Participation Plan. He noted that any changes made would require either an amendment or a technical amendment to the PPP.

- Mr. Pollack inquired of Mr. MacDonald regarding the level of complexity associated with this issue.
- Mr. MacDonald responded on behalf of staff that the approval being considered today is for use in the development of the next long-range plan, which still has approximately one year remaining. He clarified that this action does not set the document in stone. Even if the TPC approves it, any chapters or appendices may be revised over the course of the next year as the planning process continues.
- Mr. Pollack questioned whether there is a reason this document and the PPP cannot diverge. He asked whether they are required to mirror one another, noting that while he understands the policies originated from the PPP, he is unsure whether that inherently means they must statutorily align with it.
- Mr. MacDonald stated that the intent is for the documents to remain consistent; however, given that the proposed revision is a subtle change, staff can accommodate it.

**Motion:**

Mr. Pollack made a motion to recommend the TPC approve Chapter 2: Outreach and Coordination for use in the DRAFT 2050 MTP development and public outreach process subject to the revision to Policy 3.

Ms. Sales-Evans seconded; the motion passed unanimously.

**5. INFORMATION ITEMS**

**A. TREDIS Tool Presentation by Consultant Team**

Brandon Irvine with EBP presented this item.

The EBP consultant presented and led a discussion on TREDIS, a comprehensive economic analysis tool. The presentation highlighted TREDIS's capabilities to evaluate economic impacts, conduct benefit–cost analyses, assess multimodal transportation options, and provide detailed scenario modeling. The presentation and discussion will demonstrate how TREDIS can support decision-making and planning for the Corpus Christi MPO by quantifying economic, social, and environmental outcomes of transportation projects, and will provide an opportunity for attendees to ask questions and provide feedback on its applications.

**Discussion:**

TAC members asked questions to clarify specific features and functionalities of the tool being presented.

**6. TAC MEMBER STATEMENTS ON LOCAL AGENCY ACTIVITIES OR ITEMS OF INTEREST**

Ms. Sales-Evans introduced Joseph Briones, TxDOT's Deputy District Engineer.

Mr. Pollack announced that the Port is developing a BUILD application for the Inland Port facility. The application is not yet available to share, but once finalized, it will be provided. The project focuses on intermodal rail improvements across the Port's 2,000-acre campus. Additionally, the Port is submitting for the Port Infrastructure Development Grant. He also noted that the project involves digital infrastructure, including a second digital twin and a variety of sensing hardware to support the Port's geospatial data systems. Staff will share more information once the project scope is finalized.

---

Mr. MacDonald announced that he received notices from the CCIA indicating that the city will apply for a BUILD grant to reconstruct their access road and one of their taxiways. He noted that the grant reporting and application system has been modified. In the past, staff used to share notices of funding opportunities (NOFOs) and other awarded projects in Texas. With these programs becoming more active again under the current administration, staff plans to resume sharing this information so that members are aware of upcoming local and regional projects. He recalled that, about a year ago, some local projects submitted under a particular category were not successful. However, other similar projects in Texas were funded, including a Corpus Christi City project in Harlingen and a Port project in Beaumont. This highlighted the value of reviewing awarded projects to inform local submissions. Staff will continue providing these notices and share insights, when possible, to assist local governments with grant applications. Mr. MacDonald noted that the Port project could be significant if awarded and encouraged updates once the grant application is finalized.

**7. UPCOMING MEETINGS/EVENTS**

- |  |                        |                       |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>A. Transportation Policy Committee:</b> | <b>Regular Meeting</b> | <b>March 5, 2026</b>  |
| <b>B. Technical Advisory Committee:</b>    | <b>Regular Meeting</b> | <b>March 19, 2026</b> |

**8. ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:39 a.m.